

## REMARKS


Claims 1-30 were rejected as anticipated by Gibbs. While Gibbs does discuss uploading of information in the form of providing updates that could go from a client to a server, Gibbs has nothing about scheduling those updates as set forth in the pending claims. In particular, with respect to claim 1, there is no scheduling a data upload session based on a message received on a client from a server. Based on a review of the reference, it is respectfully submitted that the reference does not teach such information.

Page 4 of the office action, at line 2, indicates that scheduling a data upload session based on the message may be anticipated by "see video feeds uploading data to the server." But even if there is uploading of data, there is no scheduling of data uploads based on a message from the server to the client.

In view of these remarks, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2004



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]